

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Poojan Thakrar,

Civil No. 24-cv-1901 (JMB/DJF)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

StockX, LLC,

Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Poojan Thakrar’s Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (ECF No. 2) (“IFP Application”). For the following reasons, the Court denies the IFP Application.

“The central question [when assessing an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (‘IFP’)] is whether the movant can afford the costs of proceeding without undue hardship or deprivation of the necessities of life.” *Ayers v. Tex. Dep’t of Crim. Justice*, 70 F.3d 1268, 1268 (5th Cir. 1995) (per curiam) (citing *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339–40 (1948) (brackets added)); *see also, e.g., Daramola v. Dungarvin Inc.*, No. 24-cv-0761 (KMM/DJF), 2024 WL 1444100, at *1 (D. Minn. Mar. 6, 2024) (citing cases, including *Ayers*).

Based on his IFP Application, Mr. Thakrar will not experience undue hardship or be deprived of life’s necessities if he proceeds in this action without *in forma pauperis* status. Mr. Thakrar is a recent law-school graduate who received \$14,750 in monthly pay from a summer internship in 2022 and \$9,000 dollars in monthly pay from a summer

internship in 2023. (ECF No. 2 at 2.) He reports having \$38,200 in a brokerage account that appears to be completely liquid, and \$65,100 total in Roth and traditional IRAs. (*Id.*) Finally, he states that in September he will start a job that pays almost \$7,000 a month. (*See id.* at 5.) Given these factors, the Court denies the IFP Application. *See, e.g., Larson v. Minnesota Dep't of Hum. Servs.*, 23-cv-1823 (JRT/DJF), 2023 WL 4160599, at *1 (D. Minn. June 23, 2023) (denying an IFP application when the plaintiff had \$1,500 in cash with limited expenses); *Brown v. Dinwiddie*, 280 F. App'x 713, 715–16 (10th Cir. 2008) (denying an IFP application when the plaintiff had \$850.00 in his savings account).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. Plaintiff Poojan Thakrar's Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (ECF No. 2) is **DENIED** without prejudice.
2. By **June 14, 2024**, Mr. Thakrar must either: (1) pay this action's filing fee; or (2) submit a new application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action. If he does neither, the Court will recommend dismissing this action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

Dated: May 24, 2024

s/ Dulce J. Foster

Dulce J. Foster

United States Magistrate Judge